

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application. Claims 1-15 stand rejected.

Claims 8-11 and 13 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, because of confusing claim dependencies. These dependencies have been corrected by amendments to the claims above. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1 and 12 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Tilt, (US Patent No. 5,363,481).

Tilt is directed to a scrolling knob or other instrument that, when it is moved, a menu appears. Based upon the information in the appendix, which has the pseudo code for the invention disclosed, the menu presented is a pop up menu for the primary application in the main application window, in terms of the instant invention. There is no identification of a secondary application, such as printing or other application, that is accessed in response to the scrolling movement. It is believed that this is similar to the menus that appear when one does a right mouse click. The menu that appears depends upon the primary application, not on the user making a selecting that activates the secondary application.

As amended, claims 1 and 12 require that the proxy user interface be displayed with predetermined settings on the interface, and if no changes are made to those predetermined settings, the task is performed. Tilt does not disclose any task that is performed. The menu just appears, and if it is idle long enough, it disappears. When it disappears, no task is then executed with predetermined settings. This is not shown, taught nor suggested by the prior art and it is submitted that claims 1 and 12 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tilt in view of Stucka et al. (US Patent No. 5,596,702).

Tilt does not show all of the elements of the independent claim 1, from which claim 2 depends, as discussed above. The addition of Stucka to the combination does not overcome these deficiencies.

Stucka discusses a system in which many different applications can use the same, or portions of the same, user interface. The text referred to in Stucka at column 10, lines 30-36, shows that Stucka may provide a sub-interface, which notably is part of the primary user interface, not a proxy user interface. Again, there is no mention that if a proxy user interface is displayed, and no selection is made, a task is executed with the predetermined settings displayed on the proxy user interface. Returning to the sub-interface, Stucka defines the sub-hierarchies, etc., as being part of the primary user interface, and therefore this is no a proxy interface at all. See column 6, lines 25-46.

The combination of references, not showing a proxy interface with predetermined settings, cannot therefore show a secondary interface being presented when a user interacts with the proxy interface.

Therefore, the combination of references does not show a proxy interface that appears with predetermined settings that, if not changed, will be used to go execute a task, and that if changed, will present a secondary interface. It is therefore submitted that claim 2 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tilt in view of Frank et al. (US Patent No. 5,651,107).

As discussed above, Tilt does not show all of the features of the claimed invention, and Frank does not cure this deficiency.

Frank is directed to an idea of producing transparent windows. However, Frank does not overcome the deficiency of Tilt with regard to displaying a proxy interface, even in transparent form, with predetermined settings, that if not changed will result in execution of a

task with those settings. It is therefore submitted that claim 3 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tilt in view of Atkinson (US Patent No. 4,931,783).

As discussed above, Tilt does not show all of the features of the claimed invention. Atkinson does nothing to cure this deficiency. As discussed above with regard to Tilt, the menu being displayed is part of the user interface for the primary application. It is not a proxy user interface for a secondary application, such as a printer or other device. The menu items being displayed are for the primary application. If the user selects a menu selection related to a secondary application, such as a printer, a secondary interface is presented. No proxy interfaces are presented for the secondary application.

It is therefore submitted that claim 4 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tilt in view of Blades et al. (US Patent No. 5,465,358).

Blades is based upon identifying sequences of several user inputs that have a high probability of being selected. For example, a user may always click file, save and then select to save the file under its current name. The system of Blades would present that sequence as one option for the user, so selection of one sequence would cause all the portions of that sequence to be selected.

In contrast, the instant invention as claimed does not require any user input, if the user is satisfied with the predetermined settings already in place. The user initiates the secondary application, such as printing, and the predetermined settings are displayed. Without any user interaction, the application is executed. In Blades, the user would have to select a sequence to execute first, after making some selection that prompted the presentation of the interfaces.

Blades does not show the predetermined settings being used without any user inputs, whether those predetermined settings be the default settings as in claim 5, or the current settings as in claim 6.

It is therefore submitted that claims 5 and 6 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander (US Patent No. 6,118,451) in view of Blades.

Claim 7 has been amended to more clearly show that the identifier being displayed is for a secondary application, not a primary application as in Alexander. Alexander is directed to a primary user interface for a primary application, not a secondary application. Blades does not even mention secondary applications, much less a settings display for a secondary application. As discussed above, Blades is directed to a way to provide a series of command sequences from which the user can select. The combination of references does not teach the invention as claimed. It is therefore submitted that claim 7 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 9-11 are dependent from claim 7 and should be ruled allowable for that reason and for their own merits. With regard to claim 9, the combination of references does not teach that the user interface for a secondary application have a timer hidden, as the combination of references does not teach a secondary application user interface. With regard to claims 10 and 11, the combination of references does not teach the current or default settings being displayed for a secondary application. It is therefore submitted that claims 9-11 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander and Blades and further in view of McCoy et al. (US Patent No. 6,526,575).

The combination of references does not teach displaying a timer on a graphical user interface for a secondary application, where the timer is for the graphical user interface. It is therefore submitted that claim 8 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tilt in view of Stucka and further in view of Frank.

As discussed above, the combination of references does not teach a proxy user interface being displayed for a secondary application, where the proxy user interface has predetermined settings that, if not changed, will be used to execute a task, much less that the proxy user interface be a transparent overlay. It is submitted that claim 14 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tilt in view of Stucka and further in view of Atkinson.

As discussed above, the combination of references does not teach a proxy user interface being displayed for a secondary application, where the proxy user interface has predetermined settings that, if not changed, will be used to execute a task, much less that the proxy user interface be on the periphery of the primary user interface. It is submitted that claim 15 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

*Julie L. Reed*

---

Julie L. Reed  
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, PC  
1030 SW Morrison Street  
Portland, OR 97205  
(503) 222-3613  
Customer No. 20575